

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 are currently pending in the patent application. The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-13 under 35 USC 103 as unpatentable over Fiszman in view of Bruno. For the reasons set forth below, and based on the amendments presented herein, Applicants assert that the claims are allowable over the cited art.

The present application teaches and claims a method and system for performing a method for supporting automated management of resources owned by a supporter program in a system having at least one repository and a resource managing program means, comprising the steps of placing all requests in a repository comprising requests and request attributes, wherein each request defines an action to be performed, or a desired state to be achieved, the state being associated with a respective one of said resources; accessing requests by a request scheduler and reorganizing said requests into a chain of requests based on said request attributes; and invoking resource managing program means for handling the chain of said requests (independent Claims 1 and 6-9, and all claims which depend therefrom).

The inclusion and use of request attributes related to supporter programs for organizing and handling requests is
DE919990092

clearly not taught or suggested by the prior art. As expressly taught in the present Specification, the prior art used conventional scripts to describe what and how to do things to set the specific resource state. In contrast, the present inventive approach provides inventive request descriptions to define which resource state is needed, but not the way to get it done (see: the bottom of page 8 and top of page 9). The request attributes, which are the request descriptions used for organizing, sub-grouping, and executing the requests, include at least the name of the supporter program, the requested functionality, a unique string identifying a configuration containing the request, supporter-specific request parameters, the current status of the request, and a version of the supporter required to execute the request (see: page 23, line 19-page 24, line 12). The language of the independent claims has been amended to recite those request attributes, which are clearly neither taught nor suggested by the additionally cited art.

The Fiszman patent is directed to a system and method for generic process automation. With reference to Fig. 3, Fiszman provides an engine component 10 associated with a plurality of processing nodes 18. Requests from users 86 at workstations 88 are received at the engine component 10, are

DE919990092

-9-

scheduled by scheduler 74, and the request and the necessary software, retrieved from repository 82, are sent for processing to nodes 18 based on resource allocation performed by allocator 78 (see: Col. 9, lines 9-39 and Col. 11, lines 37-51. Fiszman handles each request individually, with no ordering or sub-grouping of the requests. The cited passage from Col. 9, lines 9-26 of Fiszman detail scheduling based on system constraints but do not teach or suggest organizing or scheduling based on request attributes.

With specific reference to the claim language, Applicants respectfully assert that the Fiszman patent does not teach placing all requests in a repository. Rather, Fiszman stores programs/executable software in repository 82. Fiszman does not store requests. Further, Fiszman provides no teachings of organizing requests into a chain of request based on request attributes. Rather, Fiszman handles each request individually. Finally, Fiszman does not invoke one resource managing program for handling a chain of requests. Rather, Fiszman allocates resource to handle each scheduled request.

The Examiner has newly cited the Bruno patent, concluding that the placing of requests in a queue, as taught by Bruno, could be used to modify the Fiszman system. Applicants respectfully assert, however, that even if one
DE919990092

were motivated to modify Fiszman with a request queue before a scheduler processes the requests, one would not arrive at the invention as claimed. Since neither Fiszman nor Bruno teaches that the requests are stored with the expressly claimed request attributes, and since neither reference teaches that the request attributes are used for organizing the requests (e.g., sub-grouping requests associated with a respective supporter program as taught in the aforementioned passage from page 24), it cannot be concluded that the combination of references obviates the invention as claimed. Applicants respectfully assert that the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness against the claim language since the prior art does not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations (*In re Wilson*, 424 F. 2d 1382, 1385, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970)).

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments, reconsideration of the amended claim language in light of the remarks, withdrawal of the rejections, and allowance of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,
N. Lenz, et al

By: Anne Vachon Dougherty
Anne Vachon Dougherty
Registration No. 30,874
Tel. (914) 962-5910

DE919990092

-11-